

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 4, 7 and 10 have been amended. Claims 2, 3 and 16 were previously cancelled.

Claims 1, and 4-15 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and of the following remarks.

No new matter has been added to the application by way of the present amendment.

In regard to the Rejection of Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10 and 11 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10 and 11 under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over winterberg et al. (WO 01/82403) in view of Barton et al. (US 6,503,432) and Kim et al. (US 6,403,432). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

In response, the Applicants have amended claim 1 to introduce that the “the moving current collector sheet passes in between the first and third slot die opening”.

Neither Winterberg et al. nor Barton et al. or Kim et al. disclose passing a moving current collector between a first and third slot die opening as defined in amended claim 1.

Winterberg et al. disclose extruding a cathode, an electrolyte and a anode through a black box (extrusion nozzle 5) in between two current collectors 8 and 9. It does not disclose a single current collector sheet passing in between a first and third slot die opening.

Barton et al. disclose two extruded masses forced into an extrusion die 30 and deposited onto a support 40 at location 50. The extruded masses are therefore deposited onto one side of a support or current collector such that the current collector sheet does not pass in between a first and third slot die opening. Barton et al. (col. 13, lines 18-20) mentions that: “it is also possible to extrude multilayer structures on both sides of a current collector substrate”. However, it is not explained how to accomplish this. Barton et al. never discloses a single

current collector sheet passing in between a first and third slot die opening as defined in claim 1.

Kim et al. simply disclose a bi-face electrochemical cell assembly and is silent as to a co-extrusion process in which a single current collector sheet is passed in between a first and third slot die opening as defined in claim 1.

Therefore, at least one element of amended claim 1 is not taught by Winterberg et al. nor is it taught by Barton et al. or kim et al. alone or in combination. The Applicants submit that it would not have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made using the information disclosed in Winterberg et al., Barton et al. and kim et al. to arrive at the claimed invention without the hindsight of the present application. As such, the Examiner is requested to withdraw his rejection of amended claim 1 and claims 4, 5, 7, 10 and 11 depending therefrom.

In regard to the Rejection of Claims 6, 8 and 9 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 6, 8 and 9 under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over winterberg et al. in view of Barton et al. (US 6,503,432) and Kim et al. (US 6,403,432) as applied to claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10 and 11, and further in view of Fukumura et al. (US 5,674,556). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Referring to lines 6-13 of column 6 of Fukumura et al. describing the embodiments shown in Figs. 7A and 7B:

“Examples of coating apparatus having no backup roll are shown in FIGS. 7A and 7B for reference. The examples show embodiments different from that of the present invention. As is shown in FIGS. 7A and 7B, slot dies 7 and 7 may be placed on opposite sides of the support 1, with a clearance between the support 1 and them, in which case the slot dies 7 and 7 may be placed in opposition to each other (FIG. 7A), or they may be placed away from each other (FIG. 7B).”

It is apparent that Fukumura et al. does not describe a the multiple slot die having multiple slot die openings or a central channel within the multiple slot die as defined by claims 6, 8 and 9. Furthermore, Fukumura et al. discloses two separate coating apparatus as

opposed to multiple slot die openings. Fukumura et al. does not disclose a single current collector sheet passing in between a first and third slot die opening.

Therefore, at least one element of amended claim 1 from which claims 6, 8 and 9 depend, is not taught by Winterberg et al., by Barton et al., kim et al. and Fukumura et al. alone or in combination. The Applicants submit that it would not have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made using the information disclosed in Winterberg et al., Barton et al., kim et al. and Fukumura et al. to arrive at the claimed invention without the hindsight of the present application. As such, the Examiner is requested to withdraw his rejection of claims 6, 8 and 9.

In regard to the Rejection of Claims 12-15 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 12-15 under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over winterberg et al. as applied to claims 1 and 2, in view of applicant's admitted prior art.

The applicants submit that claims 12-15 are all dependent from amended claim 1, which the Applicants believe is now in condition for allowance. Claims 12-15 are therefore allowable as dependent on an allowable claim.

In view of the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that all of the currently pending claims are allowable and that the entire application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable to place the application in a better condition for allowance; the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

At the time of filing of the present response, the Office was authorized to charge the fees believed to be necessary to a credit card. In case of any under- or over-payment or should any additional fee be otherwise necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to credit or debit (as the case may be) Deposit Account number 502977.

Respectfully submitted,

/Alain Bernier, 59289/

Alain Bernier, Reg. No. 59,289
OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT LLP
Agent for the Applicant

OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT LLP
1000 de la Gauchetière St. West
Suite 2100
Montréal, Québec H3B 4W5
Canada

Tel. (514) 904-8100
Fax. (514) 904-8101